

DEMOCRATIC COLUMN

This column is conducted by the Democratic County Central Committee. All communications should be addressed to T. Y. Dean, chairman, Grants Pass, Oregon. Any question concerning the political situation, asked in good faith and signed, will be cheerfully answered.

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

For Supreme Judge—Thomas O'Day, of Multnomah county.

For State Food and Dairy Commissioner—W. S. Douglas of Douglas County.

For Congressman, First District—R. M. Veatch of Lane county.

For Judge, First Judicial District—J. R. Neill of Jackson county.

For Judge, First Judicial District—B. D. Dufur of Jackson county.

For Prosecuting Attorney, First District—A. E. Reames of Jackson county.

For State Senator—I. Bilyeu of Lane county.

COUNTY TICKET.

Representative—Robert Glenn Smith, Commissioner—John Wells.

Assessor—H. C. Perkins.

Sheriff—C. F. Lovelace.

County Clerk—J. A. Slover.

Treasurer—J. T. Taylor.

School Sup't.—J. H. Austin.

Surveyor—H. J. Reynolds.

Coroner—W. H. Flanagan.

Justice of the Peace—Marcus Robbins.

Constable—George Hartman.

Figures Will Not Lie But Liars Will Figure.

One of the star campaign arguments of republican speakers and papers in this county has been the increase of the cost of running the county under what it calls democratic rule. The Observer in its issue, stated that the expenses had increased, and gave the figures. Half a truth is a falsehood. The county expenses have increased, but how have they increased? An inspection of the record will show that it has been because of money expended in bridges and roads that the growing needs of the people demanded and required, and for circuit court expense, beyond the control of the county court. Here are a few items of the expenses during the years 1902 and 1903:

Court House	\$1,397.55
1902, Repairs to court house \$1,397.55	
1903, Repairs to same and vault	2,291.81
Total	\$3,689.36
Bridges and Roads	7,329.40
1902	6,739.18
1903	7,329.40
Total	\$14,069.58
Board of Prisoners, (Controlled by Sheriff)	463.81
1902	708.74
Total	\$1,172.55
Circuit Court Expenses	83.55
1902, Clerk's exhibit	55.65
1902, Clerk's exhibit	1,167.55
1903, Clerk's exhibit	962.45
1903, Clerk's exhibit	2,738.90
Total	\$5,182.95
Justice Court	75.55
1902	75.55
1903	306.55
Total	\$1,382.50

The total of these bills is \$22,431.52, and this is only a part. This does not include the money paid for the clerk's office, sheriff's office, assessor's office or any of the others. It does not include the money raised and paid out for the county schools, which in the same time amounted to about \$101,000. It does not include the expenses of elections and we had an extra election as you remember. It does not include the pauper account, which is large. It is only part. Why is our expense larger than Jackson county? Because we have a county full of mountain streams that must be bridged and our court expenses are more. How can the county court remedy it? Can it stop the circuit court? Can it refuse to build bridges? Here are some of the bridges built in the past two years: Illinois' river, 3; Atchone, 1; Steiner Creek, 1; Deer Creek, 1; Williams Creek, 1; Horse Creek, 3; Jump-off-Joe, 1; Grave Creek, 2; Wolf Creek, 2; and repairs to Rogue river bridge and building approach on south side, and many smaller bridges. And only lately the

"I have no more nervous headaches and rest very well at night."

When a woman suffers from female weakness, it is a sign of some form of bodily disease which underlies the general condition as in the case of Mrs. Wood's case, "nervous headache and weakness at night," and a corresponding nervousness. It is also a common sense idea which says if you cure the female weakness, frequently etc., you will cure the nervous headache and other signs of bodily disease.

In Pierce's Pleasure Prescription comes the womanly diseases which underlie the general health. Her specialities regularly, gives enlarged glands both in fluctuation and ulceration, and various female weaknesses. It cures headache, nervousness, sleeplessness, etc., by curing the nervous disease which causes these ailments.

Sick women are invited to consult Dr. Pierce, by letter, etc. All correspondence strictly private. Address Dr. R. V. Pierce, Buffalo, N. Y.

"I am satisfied no fatigued man in possession of the facts would ever think of criticizing the court in the premises, much less yourself, since you had absolutely no cause in the matter."

I have no doubt that the rumors which have reached your ears have been originated by some person hostile to you or your wife.

You are at liberty to refer any difficulties you may have to me in all the material facts in this letter.

Trusting that this explanation will relieve you of any further annoyances in this matter, I am ever,

J. T. TAYLOR.

Observer was abusing the county court for not building more bridges.

The interest account we pay each year on warrants amounts to about \$6,000. For several years the county levy only met the county expenses and the interest piled up. Who could help it? Any county court could keep the levy down and let the interest grow on to the debt.

The county school tax before the levy for 1903, was five mills. The law passed in 1903, requires it to be made 9½ mills, which will make the amount valued to be over \$16,000 when in 1902 it was about \$6,000. Then he sides all that Josephine county's share of the state tax for 1903 was over \$11,000 to pay the bills of the last legislature against about \$9,000 for 1902.

This is the increase, Mr. Observer.

On school levy required by law he counted of county court \$10,000.

On state tax beyond control of county court \$6,000. Total \$16,000.

And that's why, sir, the county is "raising" \$16,000 this year instead of \$9,000 in 1902. Is it information you are after? If so you have it.

Is this correct or not? Don't dodge, but speak up. Do you blame the county court for increasing the amount of money to be raised \$16,000 when the legislature increased it \$10,000? Please be fair. We ask no more next!

SMALL POX.

One of the strenuous efforts of the Observer is directed to the bill allowed by the county court for preventing an epidemic of smallpox. Why did the county court do this? Because the law required it to do so and the republican state health officers require it. It had to be done. But the cost is \$200, says the Observer, paid the county physician when he had a contract for \$25 per month to have work done. What work? Why not tell the whole truth ter once. The contract with Dr. Kremer to treat the county patients is \$100 per year, but has no bearing upon or connection with his services in connection with the board of health. For two months Dr. Kremer had to abandon his practice and employ a physician at a salary of \$150 to attend to it. For fear of carrying the smallpox to his family and friends, he had to extract himself. The services rendered covered a large part of the county, and included many trips to Selma, Williams and other distant points.

POLITICAL HONESTY.

The Oregon Observer in its last issue published an article taken from the Ashland Tribune of April 25th, referring to Mr. A. E. Reames. The article was published in the Tribune of that date, but on May 4, the Tribune contained a long editorial retracting all that referred to Mr. Reames, with the following is taken:

"On another page of this issue we print a communication from District Attorney A. E. Reames elicited by the editorial comment appearing in the Tribune April 25th last on the case at bar of the John Woods estate at Woodville.

"The statement is candid and complete as to all the features of the proceeding in the case and fully exonerates Mr. Reames as to any adverse criticism or reflection which implied in the editorial referred to. Mr. Reames' affidavit was unnecessary to establish his denial of receiving any part of the \$1000 he allowed by the court, where he is known, but it is printed along with the correspondence accompanying his letter. He appears to have had little to do with the case, not even recommending an appointment of assistant counsel. His relation to it is innocent of any action admitting of personal or professional censure."

The Observer and Mr. Newberry knew of this retraction by the Tribune, but repeated the first article as though the Tribune still stood by it. Is this honest? Is it fair?

In the same issue of the Tribune appeared a letter from Geo. H. Durbin of this place and a republican speaker from which we quote the following:

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT GLENN SMITH.

To the citizens of Josephine Co.:

If the majority of you wish the treasurer's office to be kept at the court house, I will move to that place. I am perfectly willing to keep the office where it suits the majority of the people and do not intend to anyone to be more attentive to business or accommodating than I.

Respectfully yours,
J. T. TAYLOR.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN.

Jacksonville, Oregon.

Dear Sir—I understand that you are being criticized to some extent in reference to the recent case of the State of Oregon vs. Raymond et al., the estate of John Woods, deceased, and particularly on account of the fact allowed me as associate counsel for the State in said proceeding. I sincerely hope that such criticism has for a base some political effect, and I therefore think if my duty to give you a statement of the matter, while you are at liberty to use my name as you please.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. DURBIN